

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY
IC 74-0574

Prod.
59. KEP

1 March 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Memo Dated 19 February 1974 to D/DCI/IC and
D/DCI/NIO; Subj: Proposed KIQ Evaluation
Process (KEP); Signed Paul V. Walsh, ADDI

1. I called Paul Walsh today and discussed the referenced memorandum with him. I agreed that the pilot test which is now underway should provide a basis for testing the validity of his and other concerns with the burden of the process.

2. I also asked him for a point of contact with CIA for production for the output of the KEP Section B. He suggested [redacted] who, hopefully, could take care of the DDI and the DDS&T. I also offered to brief on the points which he made in paragraph 3 of his memorandum. However, he felt that this was not necessary and the problems could be worked out as the process proceeded.

[redacted]
Chief
IC/PRG/TB

25X1

WES/lah
Distribution:

[redacted]

1-TB Chrono
✓1-IC Registry

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

19 FEB 1974

DDI-454-74

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy to the DCI for the Intelligence Community
Deputy to the DCI for National Intelligence Officers

SUBJECT : Proposed KIQ Evaluation Process (KEP)

1. I think the basic purpose of KEP is sound but have some initial concerns: (1) that the complexity of the proposed reporting system may hinder rather than facilitate meaningful evaluations and (2) that it, along with numerous other reporting requirements, may impose excessive burdens on those who are attempting to bring about the desired substantive results. I also believe that the purposes of the KEP could be achieved through much simpler programs not requiring the generation of paper of questionable value and usefulness. However, the pilot test which is now under way, confined to 12 KIQs, should provide a basis for testing the validity of these concerns.

2. Toward this end, I would suggest that all concerned keep track of the costs involved in this evaluation process so that, at the end of this test, we might assess the value of KEP against these collective costs. At that point, I think we will be in a better position to know whether the process is worth the effort, and whether it should be modified or redesigned.

3. I am not clear as to the role that KEP envisages for processing components such as NPIC, IAS, and CRS. Their role in pursuing the substantive objectives represented by the KIQs is an integral part of the intelligence process and warrants evaluation as much as production and collection. By not evaluating these activities fully, we will in some cases miss the real reasons for the deficiencies.

PAUL V. WALSH

Associate Deputy Director
for Intelligence

cc: Director of Central Intelligence
Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

25X1